

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Norfolk Division

TELESIA S.,¹

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil No. 2:21cv666

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

FINAL ORDER

Telesia S. ("Plaintiff"), pro se, brought this action seeking judicial review of the decision by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (the "Commissioner") to deny her claim for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for a report and recommendation, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation was filed on December 23, 2022, recommending that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment be **DENIED** and that the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment be **GRANTED**. ECF No. 18, at 36-37. By copy of the Report and Recommendation, each party was advised of the

¹ The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended that federal courts use only the first name and last initial of any non-government parties in Social Security cases due to privacy concerns endemic to such cases.

right to file written objections to the findings and recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. No objections were filed by either party, and the time for filing objections has expired.

Having reviewed the relevant portions of the record and finding no clear error in the Magistrate Judge's findings or reasoning,² the Court hereby **ADOPTS** in full the findings and recommendations set forth in the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge filed on December 23, 2022. ECF No. 18. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is **DENIED**, ECF No. 12, the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, ECF No. 13, and the final decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**.

The Clerk shall forward a copy of this Final Order to Plaintiff and to counsel of record for Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ 

Mark S. Davis

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Norfolk, Virginia
January 23, 2023

² As no objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed, this Court must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).